



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,288	04/07/2000	Stephane Ayala	032326-057	1602
21839	7590	10/13/2006		
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER TRINH, MINH N	
			ART UNIT 3729	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/545,288

Applicant(s)

AYALA ET AL.

Examiner

Minh Trinh

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2006.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-24,27,29 and 40-46 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-12,27,29 and 40-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 14-23 is/are rejected.
 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,13 and 24 is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicants request reconsideration of nonelected claims 45-46 has been noted but not persuasive as reasons provided from record, such as Inventions are independent from one another in this relationship the inventions are distinct because (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination claims 45-46 as claimed does not require "the connecting at least one ends of the antenna to a respective pad by means of an insulation bridge disposed on a surface of the turn that is away from the support sheet", etc., as required by the invention as originally claimed. The subcombination has separate utility such as for connecting an end of the antenna or connection pad to an electronic module, etc. It is also noted that inventions above have different mode of operations, functions and/or effects. See MPEP § 806.05(d). Accordingly, claims 40-46 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to the non-elected inventions (see reasons set forth above). Accordingly, claims 45-46 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Further, Applicants are not entitled to examination of multiple independent inventions in one application. Moreover, examination of the independent inventions herein would clearly present a burden because the searches will not be coextensive. The restriction requirement provided in the previous Action was repeated and made

Art Unit: 3729

Final. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected inventions or other appropriate action such as petition the holding Restriction to the Commissioner (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fidalgo (5,598,032). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, dated 4/27/06.

3. Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidago. This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, dated 4/27/06.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/27/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First applicants argue that the reference fails to teach the production of "the antenna having two turns and a pair of connection pads on a common side of the antenna turns" (see under the "Remarks", pages 1 and top of page 2). The examiner disagrees because the Fidalgo clearly discloses the above features where the antenna 5 having at least two turns see Fig. 2, and further, each ends of the turns does have a connection pad as terminal 15 associated therefrom (see Fig. 2, and the discussion at col. 3, lines 34-35 and col. 4, lines 44-46, etc). Further, Fig. 3 depict the antenna turns 5 and pad as terminal 15 are being formed on the same side of the substrate which is readable as common side of the antenna. Therefore, the limitations as described above are considered to be met by Fidalgo.

Note Applicants' arguments are more specific than the claim language. Applicant lends great means to the "common side " The examiner takes the position that the "common side" is broad and has not been greatly limited by the claims. In this case, the prior art relied upon satisfies the examiners interpretation of the claim languages i.e., the connection pads 15 of the Fidalgo does dispose on a same or common side (top side of the substrate see Fig. 3) of the antenna turns 5 similar to that as claimed by the instant application. Applicants' arguments are not persuasive and are not clearly point out the patentable novelty which they thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the rejections made. Therefore, the prior art rejection is maintained for same reasons of the record.

Art Unit: 3729

5. Claims 4, 13 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. A complete reply to this final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected inventions (claims 6-12, 27, 29, 40-46) or other appropriate action such as petition the holding Restriction to the Commissioner (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Interviews After Final

7. Applicants note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing). Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

Conclusion

8. It is noted that any amendment made to the disclosure and the claims. Applicant requires to point out the support provide numeral references to the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure (i.e., page and line numbers and reference number

Art Unit: 3729

associated with from the drawings) for better clarity (See 37CFR 1.111 and section 2163.06 of the MPEP).

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3729

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mt
10/4/06


MINHTRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER